

September 19, 2002

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 383
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 00-119-(5)
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 00-119-(5)
PETITIONER: THOMAS L. MILLER
42540 6TH STREET EAST, SUITE B
LANCASTER, CA 93535
PALMDALE ZONED DISTRICT
FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3-VOTE)**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for Zone Change No. 00-119-(5), and Conditional Use Permit No. 00-119-(5), together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.
2. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the ordinance, to change zones within the Palmdale Zoned District as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission (Zone Change No. 00-119-(5)).
3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the necessary findings to affirm the Regional Planning Commission's approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 00-119-(5).

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

- ?? Update the zoning on the subject property to allow the property owner to develop the property with uses compatible with the existing surrounding uses.
- ?? Establish development standards that ensure future development on the subject property will be compatible with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This zone change and conditional use permit promotes the County's Strategic Plan goal of Service Excellence. The project components (zone change, conditional use permit) were carefully researched and analyzed to ensure that quality information regarding the subject property is available.

This zone change and conditional use permit also promotes the County's vision for improving the quality of life in Los Angeles County. The approval of this zone change and conditional use permit will allow the development of an airport shuttle service, providing convenience for local residents while promoting good air quality management goals.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Implementation of the proposed zone change should not result in any new significant costs to the County or to the Department of Regional Planning; no request for financing is being made.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Not Applicable

The Regional Planning Commission conducted concurrent public hearings on Zone Change and Conditional Use Permit Case Nos. 00-119-(5) on February 6, 2002 and April 3, 2002. The two zoning requests before the Commission were: 1) a zone change from the existing R-A-1 (Residential – Agriculture, one acre minimum required area) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on a 4.2-acre parcel, and 2) a conditional use permit to authorize the development of a airport shuttle service. The Regional Planning Commission voted to approve the requested zone change and conditional use permit at their August 21, 2002 meeting.

A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Sections 65335 and 65856 of the Government Code. Notice of the hearing must be given pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65355 and 65856 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The proposed zone change and conditional use permit will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.

Based on the Negative Declaration, adoption of the proposed zone change will not have a significant effect on the environment.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES OR (OR PROJECTS)

Action on the zone change is not anticipated to have a negative impact on current services.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Donald C. Culbertson, Administrator
Current Planning Division

DCC:FM:kms

Attachments: Commission Resolution, Findings & Conditions, Staff Report
& Attachments

C: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Assessor
Director, Department of Public Works
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
ZONE CHANGE CASE NO. 00-119-(5)

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing in the matter of Zone Change Case No. 00-119-(5) on February 6, 2002 and April 3, 2002; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting a change of zone from R-A-1 (Residential – Agriculture, one acre minimum required area) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on a 4.2-acre parcel. The Development Program designation will assure that development occurring after rezoning will conform to the approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied to this case, the conditional use permit will restrict the development of the re-zoned site to the proposed airport shuttle service as shown on the site plan marked Exhibit “A”. No other development is permitted on the property unless a new conditional use permit is first obtained.

2. The subject property is located on the southeast corner of Avenue S and Guyon Avenue, Palmdale, and in the Palmdale Zoned District.
3. The zone change request was heard concurrently with Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5) at February 6, 2002 and April 3, 2002 public hearings.
4. Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5) is a related request to authorize a shuttle service to Los Angeles International Airport that includes a 7,200 square foot commercial building, a bus maintenance and staging area, long-term parking, rental car storage, and customer parking. The requested zone change is necessary to authorize the proposed use of the subject property.
5. The site plan for the conditional use permit, marked Exhibit "A", depicts a 7,200 square foot building, with 4,800 square feet of the building shown as offices for the airport express and car rentals.
6. A need for the proposed zone classification exists within the community. The Antelope Valley is in need of the proposed service to reduce freeway congestion and emissions and to provide transportation options to the Community.
7. Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning of the subject property in that the location of the subject property a location that is now considered the "gateway" to the Antelope Valley, making it an ideal location for a transit service.
8. The subject property is a proper location for the proposed M-1-DP zoning classification and placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practice because the use advocates good air quality management goals.
9. The proposed Zone Change from R-A-1 to M-1-DP is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Countywide General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan.
10. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the initial study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
11. After consideration of the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, the Commission finds on the basis of the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the proposed change of zone will have a significant effect on the

environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.

RESOLVED, That the Regional Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Board of Supervisors hold a public hearing to consider the recommended change of zone from R-A-1 (Residential – Agriculture, one acre minimum required area) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on the 4.2-acre subject property.
1. That the Board of Supervisors certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration, and determine that Zone Change Case No. 00-119-(5) will not have a significant impact upon the environment.
2. That the Board of Supervisors find the recommended zoning is consistent with the Los Angeles County General Plan.
3. That the Board of Supervisors find that the public convenience, the general welfare and good zoning practice justify the recommended change of zone.
4. That the Board of Supervisors adopt the above recommended change of zone.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on August 21, 2002.

Rosie Ruiz, Secretary
County of Los Angeles
Regional Planning Commission

December 17, 2002

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Tom Miller
Antelope Valley Express
42540 5th E. Unit B
Lancaster, CA 93535

RE: ZONE CHANGE & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 00-119-(5)
A request for the development of an airport express shuttle service.

Dear Applicant:

PLEASE NOTE: This document contains the Regional Planning Commission's findings and conditions relating to **APPROVAL** of the above referenced Conditional Use Permit as well as their recommendation for **APPROVAL** to the Board of Supervisors of the related zone change.

Your attention is called to condition number 3 of the Conditional Use Permit which states that this grant shall not become effective until the Board of Supervisors has adopted the zone change submitted concurrently with this application.

Pursuant to Section 22.60.230, subsection B.2, when the Regional Planning Commission makes a recommendation on a legislative action concurrently with approval of a nonlegislative land use application, the Board of Supervisors shall call the nonlegislative application up for concurrent review. Please be advised that this may result in modification of the findings and/or conditions attached hereto.

Payment of fees required by the conditions of approval will not be accepted until the Board of Supervisors has approved the zone change.

Very truly yours,

Department of Regional Planning
James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

Frank Meneses, Section Head
Zoning Permits Section

FM:kms

Enclosures: Findings and Conditions

c: JT Engineering, Board of Supervisors, Department of Public Works (Building and Safety),
Department of Public Works (Subdivision Mapping), Zoning Enforcement

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 00-119-(5)

**FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES****REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATES: FEBRUARY 6, 2002
APRIL 3, 2002****SYNOPSIS:**

The applicant is requesting authorization to develop a 4.2-acre parcel with an airport shuttle service. The proposed shuttle service, the Antelope Valley Airport Express, includes shuttle bus service from the subject property to Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), long-term parking, car rental and rental car fleet storage. The project also includes a 7,200 square foot building to be used for the car rental and airport express operations. The applicant is currently running a shuttle service from Palmdale to LAX, using the Palmdale Holiday Inn as the passenger pick-up area.

The applicant is concurrently requesting a change of zone from RA-1 (Residential – Agriculture, one acre minimum required area) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program) on the 4.2-acre subject property.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMISSIONFebruary 6, 2002 Public Hearing

A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Regional Planning Commission. All Commissioners were present. Three (3) people testified in support of the request, the owner/applicant, the owner's architect, and a neighboring property owner. There was discussion regarding the City of Palmdale Planning Department's strong opposition to the project that was expressed in letters to the Commission.

There being no further testimony, the Commission voted (5-0) to continue the public hearing in order to give the applicant time to meet with the City of Palmdale.

April 3, 2002

A continued public hearing was held on April 3, 2002. All Commissioners were present. Three (3) people testified in support of the request, the owner/applicant, the owner's architect, and Susan Koleda, a Planner with the City of Palmdale. The applicant reported that he had met with the City of Palmdale's Planning Department and discussed the project in detail. Ms. Koleda stated that although the City still had some concerns regarding the project, they felt the applicant made compromises that will enhance the project.

There being no opposition and no further testimony, the Commission voted (5-0) to close the public hearing, indicate its intent to approve the conditional use permit, and instruct Staff to prepare the final environmental documentation and findings and conditions for approval.

Findings

1. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to authorize the development of a 4.2-acre parcel with a shuttle service to Los Angeles International Airport that includes a 7,200 square foot commercial building, a bus maintenance and staging area, long-term parking, rental car storage, and customer parking, located on the southeast corner of Avenue S and Guyon Avenue, Palmdale, in the Palmdale Zoned District, pursuant to Sections 22.32.040 and 22 40.040 of the Los Angeles County Code.
2. The subject property is 4.2 acres in size. Access to the site is via Avenue S to the north and Guyon Avenue to the west.
3. Zoning on the subject property is R-A-1 (Residential Agriculture, one acre minimum required area). The proposed shuttle service is not permitted in the R-A-1 zone. Concurrent with this approval, however, the Commission is recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve Zone Change Case No. 00-119-(5). If approved by the Board of Supervisors, the subject property will be rezoned to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing, Development Program).
4. The requested conditional use permit is consistent with the proposed M-1-DP zoning classification. Section 22.40.040 of the County Code provides that property in a DP zone may be used for any use permitted in the basic one, subject to the requirements of a conditional use permit, including an approved development program. Pursuant to Section 22.32.040 of the County Code, the proposed uses are permitted uses in the A-2 zone.
5. Surrounding zoning consists of R-A-1 to the east, south, and west, and the City of Palmdale to the north.
6. The subject property is currently vacant.
7. Surrounding land uses consist of vacant land to the north, south, east and west.
8. The subject property is classified as Non-Urban II in the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan. Residential density for the Non-Urban II classification is 1.0 dwelling unit per acre. The Plan allows non-residential uses in non-urban areas subject to an application process that involves a public hearing and the appropriate conditioning of the design of the project such that the negative impacts on adjacent land uses will be minimized. Non-residential uses include local and highway oriented commercial and industrial uses to serve the needs of local residents. The proposed project will serve the local community and is consistent with the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan.

9. Subsequent to the applicant's meeting with the City of Palmdale, a revised site plan was submitted. The applicant's revised site plan, marked Exhibit "A", depicts the subject property developed with a 7,200 square foot building to be used for the airport express and car rental business offices. The site plan also depicts parking spaces devoted to customer parking, rental car fleet storage, long-term parking, and bus parking. A 4,875 square foot bus maintenance building is shown. Landscaped planters are shown on both the Guyon Avenue and Avenue S frontages, and planters are shown scattered throughout the parking lot. Access to the site is shown via three driveways from Guyon Avenue to the west and one driveway from Avenue S to the north.
10. The applicant has provided conceptual elevations of the commercial building and garage. The elevations have incorporated architectural details such as roofline variations, covered walks with extended second floors (the use of an open balcony over a porch area), and divided lights in the window panes.
11. The applicant will be required to submit a development program, consisting of a plot plan and a progress schedule, as required by Section 22.40.050 of the County Code.
12. The proposed shuttle service is required to comply with the development standards of the M-1 zone pursuant to Section 22.32.080 of the County Code, relating to outside storage or display, vehicle storage, and signage.
13. The project complies with the requirements of the zone requiring all outside storage or display open to view from the exterior boundary of the site to be enclosed by a solid wall or fence. No outside storage is proposed for this project other than the parking and storage of shuttle buses and vans.
14. Section 22.32.080 requires vehicle storage and parking to be provided as required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52. Section 22.52.1060.D. of the County Code requires where parking facilities are located adjacent to the front lot lines that a solid masonry wall not less than 30 inches nor more than 42 inches in height, shall be established parallel to and not nearer than five feet to the front lot line. As the applicant's site plan depicts parking perpendicular to the north (Avenue S) and west (Guyon Avenue) property lines, a low wall is required on those frontages. The applicant's site plan does not depict these walls. As a condition of approval of this grant, the applicant will be required to submit a revised site plan depicting these walls.
15. Pursuant to Section 22.52.1060.E. of the County Code, at least two percent of the gross area of the parking lot shall be landscaped. The applicant's site plan

does not include a landscape table. As a condition of approval of the grant, the applicant will be required to submit a revised site plan listing the percentage of landscaping provided within the parking lot.

16. The site plan depicts a 7,200 square foot building. 4,800 square feet of the building are shown as offices for the airport express and car rentals. Section 22.52.1100 of the County Code requires one automobile space for each 400 square feet of floor area used for offices. As the applicant is unsure how the remaining 2,400 square feet of the building are to be used, the parking for that space will be calculated based on the requirement for commercial uses; which is one automobile space for each 250 square feet of floor area. The parking for the bus maintenance building is calculated under Industrial Uses, one parking space is required for each 500 square feet of floor area.
4,800 square feet/400 square feet = 12 parking spaces required
2,400 square feet/250 square feet = 10 parking spaces required
4,875 square feet/500 square feet = 10 parking spaces required
A total of 32 parking spaces are required for the proposed buildings. As much of the site plan is devoted to parking, the applicant meets this parking requirement. As a condition of approval of this grant, the applicant will be required to submit a revised site plan that lists the number of parking spaces (standard, compact, handicapped) that would be provided for the buildings. In addition, those parking spaces located adjacent the buildings should be marked "reserved" for those buildings.
17. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires two (2) of the required parking spaces to be handicapped accessible, one of which must be handicapped van accessible. The applicant's site plan depicts four (4) handicapped spaces. However, as these spaces are not dimensioned it is unclear if any of them are van accessible. As a condition of approval of this grant, the applicant will be required to submit a revised site plan that dimensions the parking spaces.
18. Pursuant to Section 22.52.1060 of the County Code, specifications for development of parking facilities, all land used for parking where access to a parking space or spaces is from a highway, street or alley which is paved with asphalted or concrete surfacing, such parking areas, as well as the maneuvering areas and driveways used for access thereto, shall be paved with concrete or asphalt surfacing. A qualified engineer, retained to furnish a jobsite soil analysis, finds that said base is unnecessary to insure a firm and unyielding subgrade, equal, from the standpoint of the service, life and appearance of the asphalt surfacing, to that provided if said base were required, and so states in writing, together with a copy of his findings and certification to such effect. The applicant's site plan depicts the south end of the subject property, where long

term parking and the bus staging area is proposed, is shown as gravel. The applicant has indicated that this area will remain gravel only until that area is required for parking, and then it would be paved. As a condition of approval of this grant, the applicant will be required to submit a revised site plan depicting the entire site as it would be at final completion, with all phasing indicated.

19. Signs shall comply with the requirements of Part 10 of Chapter 22.52. The applicant has not provided any sign plans with this request. The applicant will be required to submit sign plans to the Commission and the Director of Planning for approval depicting any proposed signs on the subject property prior to final approval of this request, or they may be submitted under a Revised Exhibit "A" prior to installation. The signs shall be subject to M-1 zone limitations unless modified by the Commission with this conditional use permit.
20. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the initial study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.
21. The Department of Public Works provided comments dated 1-31-02, recommending that the permit not be approved at this time and that a revised site plan be required to be submitted to said Department. In addition, the Department of Public Works was consulted during the environmental review phase of this project. The Department's Environmental Programs Division, Grading and Drainage Unit, and Traffic and Lighting Division have provided comments that are included as attachments to this document.
22. The County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, Department Headquarters, was consulted by Staff during the environmental review of this project. The Sheriff's Department, in their letter dated April 25, 2001, recommends a security guard be present on the property during the hours of darkness. As a condition of approval of this grant, a security guard on the subject property during hours of darkness will be required.
23. The County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, Department of Public Health, was consulted by Staff during the environmental review phase of this project. The Department has provided recommended conditions in a letter dated October 3, 2001; their comment letter has been included as conditions of approval of this grant.
24. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, was

consulted by Staff during the environmental review phase of this project. They have provided conditions and recommendations in their letter dated April 23, 2001; their comment letter has been included as conditions of approval of this grant.

25. The properties directly north of the subject property (across Avenue S) are within the City of Palmdale. The City of Palmdale has written letters in opposition dated October 20, 2000, March 15, 2001, and January 24, 2002. Their concerns include the proposed septic system, the impact the proposed M-1 zoning would have on neighboring properties, the subject property is within the City of Palmdale's sphere of influence, and that the subject property is within an area currently being proposed for annexation into the City of Palmdale; once annexed the site will be zoned R-1-1 making the proposed use nonconforming.
26. The City of Palmdale has written a letter dated April 3, 2002, in which they acknowledge the applicant has made compromises to their proposal at the request of the City. However, their main concern regarding the project remains to be the applicant is installing a septic system instead of a self-contained sewer system, which is not in conformance with the City of Palmdale's General Plan. However, according to Stephen Layne with the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, a self-contained sewer system would not be approved by the County.
27. One letter in opposition to this request was received prior to the public hearing. The letter was from an adjacent property owner. Her concerns included the car traffic and the non-point source pollution that would be brought to the area, and that the zone change to M-1 in this area would set the precedent for future zone changes to M-1 in the area, which is not in the best interest of the community.
28. The subject property falls with the City of Palmdale's Avenue S Corridor Area Plan. The planning area extends approximately four (4) miles along Avenue S and generally includes land located about a half mile north and south of Avenue S. The Plan includes architectural guidelines and streetscape and parkway design for commercial development along Avenue S. The plan recognizes that areas outside the City's boundaries would not be required to comply with the provisions adopted under the Plan, and to achieve full compliance annexation of the unincorporated areas is needed.
29. The applicant, the Antelope Valley Airport Express, Inc., currently operates an express shuttle service from Sixth Street East in Lancaster and has been established there since 1984. The Airport Express also currently offers service from the Palmdale Holiday Inn to LAX. The services based out of the Holiday Inn's parking lot are proposed to be moved to the subject property. The shuttle

service uses buses, mini-buses, and vans for transporting customers.

30. The City of Palmdale has developed two (2) park and ride lots within approximately 1,000 feet of the subject property. These are standard park and ride facilities, consisting of a paved lot with bus shelters. These lots are developed within the City of Palmdale's boundaries. What the applicant is proposing is a similar use, but it is more intense, including bus storage and maintenance provisions. The proposed bus shuttle service is compatible with these existing park and ride lots.
31. The Commission finds the Antelope Valley is in need of such a service as the one proposed to reduce freeway congestion and emissions, and to provide transportation options to the Community.
32. The Commission finds that, although the M-1-DP zoning is required for the outside bus storage portion of this request, it should in no way be interpreted as a precedent to allow other properties in the vicinity to be zoned M-1-DP.
33. The Commission finds, although they are in favor of granting the M-1-DP for this use, it is for the purpose of allowing an airport shuttle service only, and not for any other use in the M-1-DP zone.
34. The Commission finds, that, with the conditions of approval, the proposed use is consistent with the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan and is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

- A. That the requested use at the proposed location is consistent with the adopted general plan for the area:
- B. That the requested use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety and general welfare;
- C. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance or as is otherwise required in order to integrate the proposed uses with the uses in the

surrounding area;

- D. That the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required; and
- E. That the development program submitted provides necessary safeguards to insure completion of the proposed development by the applicant, forestalling substitution of a lesser type of development contrary to the public convenience, welfare or development needs of the area.

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Sections 22.40.060 and 22.56.090, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

- 1. The Regional Planning Commission has considered the Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, finds on the basis on the whole record before the Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.
- 2. In view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5) is **APPROVED**, subject to the attached conditions and further subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors of Zone Change Case No. 00-119-(5).

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Concurring: Commissioners Valadez, Helsley, Bellamy, Rew, Modugno

Dissenting: None

Abstaining: None

Absent: None

Action Date: August 21, 2002

Attachments: Conditions
Affidavit

JF:FM:kms 08-15-02

1. This grant authorizes the use of the subject property for an airport express shuttle service as depicted on the approved Revised Exhibit "A", subject to all of the following conditions of approval.
2. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 8, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 10 and 11. Further, this grant shall not be effective unless and until the Board of Supervisors has adopted Zone Change 00-119-(5) and an ordinance reflecting such change of zone has become effective.
4. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.
5. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

- b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee in accordance with Los Angeles County Code Section 2.170.010.

6. This grant will expire unless used within 2 years from the date of approval. A one-year time extension may be requested in writing with the appropriate fee six months before the expiration date.
7. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
8. Prior to the use of this grant, the property owner or permittee shall record the terms and conditions of the grant in the office of the County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the property owner or permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee of the subject property.
9. **This grant will terminate August 21, 2022.**

Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect. At least six (6) months prior to the expiration of this permit and in the event that the Permittee intends to continue operations after such date, a new Conditional Use Permit application shall be filed with the Department of Regional Planning. The application shall be a request for a continuance of the use permitted under this grant, whether including or not including modification to the use at that time.

10. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions. The permittee shall deposit with the County of Los Angeles the sum of **\$3,000.00**. These monies shall be placed in a performance fund which shall be used exclusively to compensate the Department of Regional Planning for all expenses incurred while inspecting the premises to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval. The fund provides for **twenty (20) annual inspections**. Inspections shall be unannounced.

If additional inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse the Department of Regional Planning for all

additional inspections and for any enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be \$150.00 per inspection, or the current recovery cost, whichever is greater.

11. The permittee shall remit processing fees payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code. The project is not *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife and is not exempt from payment of a fee to the California Department of Fish and Game pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code. The current fee amount is \$1,275.00.
12. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public's health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.
13. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities shall be provided as may be required by said Department.
14. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
15. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in compliance with requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services. Adequate water and sewage facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of said department.
16. All structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Department of Public Works.
17. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not provide pertinent information about said premises.

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

18. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations. Inspections shall be made as provided in Condition No.10 to ensure compliance with this condition, including any additional inspections as may be necessary to ensure such compliance.
19. Within sixty (60) days of approval of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three copies of revised plans, similar to Exhibit "A" page 1 of 3, as presented at the public hearing that depict, in compliance with Section 22.40.050.A of the County Code, the location of all proposed structures, the alteration or demolition of any existing structures, and development features including grading, yards, walls, walks, landscaping, height, bulk and arrangement of buildings and structures, signs, the color and appearance of buildings and structures, and other features as may be needed to make the development attractive, adequately buffered from adjacent more restrictive uses, and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area, and showing the following: 1) a low wall or landscaped berms a minimum of 30 inches and not to exceed 42 inches along the Avenue S and Guyon Avenue frontages, 2) a landscape table depicting a minimum of two percent of the gross area of the parking lot landscaped, 3) depiction of which 22 parking spaces will be marked "reserved" for the 7,200 square foot building and which 10 parking spaces will be marked "reserved" for the 4,875 square foot building, 4) the projected phasing of the project with the project site depicted how it will look at complete build-out, 5) dimension a typical standard, compact, and handicapped space. The property shall be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved revised Exhibit "A". All revised plot plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.
20. Within sixty (60) days of approval of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval a development progress schedule which shall include all phases of development and indicate the sequence and time period within which the improvements described will be made, as required by Section 22.040.050.B of the Los Angeles County Code.
21. Within sixty (60) days of approval of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three copies of a landscape plan, which may be incorporated into the revised Exhibit "A" described in Condition No. 19. The landscape plan shall show the size, type, and location of all plants, trees, and watering facilities. The landscape plan shall incorporate, to the extent feasible, the street trees and plant species as defined in the City of Palmdale's Avenue S Corridor Area Plan Landscape Design Standards. For the life of this grant the permittee shall maintain all landscaping in a neat, clean and healthful condition,

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

including proper pruning, weeding, removal of litter, fertilizing and replacement of plants when necessary.

22. The permittee shall submit for approval three copies of building elevations of both the office/retail building and the bus storage building, to the Director of Planning within sixty days of the approval date of this grant. The elevations should depict the proposed materials and architectural style to be used. All proposed buildings should be in subdued colors that will blend in with the surroundings. To the extent feasible, the building materials, finishes, and colors shall conform to the City of Palmdale's Avenue S Corridor Area Plan Architectural Materials Design Guidelines. The overall height of the structures shall not exceed 35-feet above finished grade. The property shall be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved elevations. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.
23. The permittee shall submit for approval three copies of any signs proposed for the subject property, to the Director of Planning within sixty days of the approval date of this grant. The proposed signs shall be in conformance with the County Code's sign development standards for the M-1 zone. In addition, in compliance with the City of Palmdale's Zoning Ordinance and Avenue S Corridor Area Plan, the permittee shall not install any pole-mounted signs. The property shall be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the approved sign plans. All revised plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.
24. The following development program conditions shall apply:
 - a. No building or structure of any kind except a temporary structure used only in the developing of the property according to the development program shall be built, erected, or moved onto any part of the property.
 - b. All improvements shall be completed prior to the occupancy of any structures.
 - c. Where one or more buildings in the projected development are designated as primary buildings, building permits for structures other than those so designated shall not be issued until the foundations have been constructed for such primary building or buildings.
25. The construction and operation of the airport express shuttle service use shall be further subject to all of the following restrictions:
 - a. The applicant shall submit a written development plan in conjunction with the Revised Exhibit "A" in accordance with Section 22.40.050 of the County Code;
 - b. That all trash enclosure areas shall be screened from public and private

view corridors;

- c. All material graded should be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust during the construction phase. Watering should occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. All clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e. greater than 20 mph averaged over one hour) to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Any materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust;
- d. Project construction activity shall be limited to those hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Saturday. All stationary construction noise sources shall be sheltered or enclosed to minimize adverse effect on nearby offices, residences and neighborhoods. Generators and pneumatic compressors shall be noise protected in a manner that will minimize noise inconvenience to adjacent residences. Parking of construction worker vehicles shall be on-site and restricted to areas that do not adversely affect residences located to the south and west of the subject property;
- e. The permittee shall comply with the Department of Public Works conditions dated January 30, 2002, or as otherwise modified by said Department;
- f. The permittee shall comply with the Fire Department's conditions dated January 10, 2002, or as otherwise modified by said Department;
- g. The permittee shall comply with NPDES requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Los Angeles Department of Public Works;
- h. The permittee shall comply with all the conditions and recommendations set forth by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board in their letter dated April 23, 2001;
- i. The permittee shall comply with all conditions and recommendations set forth by Sheriff's Department of Los Angeles County in their letter dated April 25, 2001;
- j. The permittee shall comply with all conditions and recommendations set forth by the Department of Health Services in their letter dated October 3, 2001;

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

- k. The permittee shall comply with all conditions and recommendations set forth by the Grading and Drainage Unit of the Department of Public Works in their letter dated October 1, 2001;
- l. All roof-top equipment should be screened from public view, either through parapets, gables or some other architectural feature, or should be ground mounted if architectural screening is not feasible;
- m. All electrical, cable, plumbing conduits/piping, HVAC equipment and ducting, etc. should be concealed from public view;
- n. All exterior lighting shall be shielded and directed away from neighboring residences to prevent direct illumination and glare. All light standards visible to the general public should be consistent with the overall architectural style of the project with respect to design, materials, color, and color of light. Parking lot light standards should not exceed fourteen feet in height. Security lighting fixtures shall not project above the fascia or roofline of the building on which they are mounted;
- o. The permittee shall connect to the public sewer system when it is installed within 100 feet of the subject property;
- p. The permittee shall use only biodegradable soaps and detergents for any bus washing or maintenance;
- q. Only buses and minivans that cannot be brought to a traditional car wash may be washed on site, rental cars are to be washed off-site;
- r. The permittee shall construct a non-permeable pad in the car wash area. In addition, a catch basin shall be installed so that water runoff goes into the public sewer system when it is available;
- s. A security guard shall be on-site in all hours of darkness.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER No. ZC/CUP 00-119

1. 1. **DESCRIPTION:**

Application for a conditional use permit and zone change to authorize the development of a one story 7,200 s.f. building which will consist of a donut shop, a car rental area, an LAX airport express shuttle service, and a bus maintenance area, rental car fleet storage, and parking areas. The zone change request is to change the existing R-A-1 to M-1-DP.

2. 2. **LOCATION:**

3. Southeast corner of Avenue S and Guyon Avenue, Palmdale

4.
5. 3. **PROPONENT:**

JT Engineering, Inc.
25030 West Avenue Stanford
Valencia, CA 91355

6. 4. **FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:**

BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. **LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:**

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Christina D. Tran

DATE: October 18, 2001

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: 00-119

CASES: ZC, CUP



***** INITIAL STUDY *****

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Page 23 of 57

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: June 20, 2000 Staff Member: Tabitha Lam / Christina D. Tran

Thomas Guide: 4285 J-4 USGS Quad: Ritter Ridge

Location: Southeast corner of Avenue S and Guyon Avenue, Palmdale

Description of Project: Application for a conditional use permit and zone change to authorize the development of a one story 7,200 s.f. building which will consist of a 2,400 s.f. donut shop, a 2,400 s.f. car rental area, and a 2,400 s.f. LAX airport express shuttle service area. In addition, the applicant is proposing 4,875 s.f. airport bus maintenance area, long-term parking, rental car fleet storage, and associated customer parking. The zone change request is to change the existing R-A-1 (Residential Agricultural Zone – one acre minimum required area) to M-1-DP (Light Manufacturing Zone – Development Program). Operating hours will be 24 hours with a maximum of three employees working each of the three shifts.

Gross Acres: 4.2 acres

Environmental Setting: The subject property is currently vacant with access from Avenue S, a paved improved street. The overall site is gently sloping to the northwest with approximately 10 feet of elevation change across the site. There is a 70-foot easement for utilities along the north edge of the property. Surrounding land uses consist of vacant land within 500 feet of the site; however, the Antelope Valley Freeway is further east and the City of Palmdale park and ride lot further west.

Zoning: R-A-1

General Plan: Non-urban

Community/Area wide Plan: Non-urban 2 (Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan)

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
☐ Los Angeles Region
☒ Lahontan Region
☐ Coastal Commission
☐ Army Corps of Engineers

☒ *Caltrans*

☐

☐

Trustee Agencies

☒ None

☐ State Fish and Game

☐ State Parks

☐

☐

☐

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
☐ National Parks
☐ National Forest
☐ Edwards Air Force Base
☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area

☒ *City of Palmdale*

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
☐ SCAG Criteria
☐ Air Quality
☐ Water Resources
☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area

☐

☐

☐

☐ Subdivision Committee

☒ DPW: *Traffic & Lighting, Geology & Soil, Drainage & Grading, Environmental Programs*

☒ Health Department: *Environmental Health*

☒ Sheriff Department

☐

☐



IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			<u>Less than Significant Impact/No Impact</u>			
			<u>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</u>			
				<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>		
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg				Potential Concern
<u>HAZARDS</u>	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<u>RESOURCES</u>	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<u>SERVICES</u>	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<u>OTHER</u>	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

Development Policy Map

- Designation: Other Non-urban and Agricultural
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of
printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the _____ environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will _____ reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

evidence that the project may have
to factors listed above as “significant”.

a significant impact due

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

- ☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <i>Special Studies Zone, San Andreas Fault</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <i>Per "Depth to Groundwater Report," groundwater measured at 24.3 feet</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

DPW concluded that project will not have significant environmental effects in their letter dated 4/17/01.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No Impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

Page 31 of 57

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

DPW gave conceptual approval of drainage concept/SUSMP on 10/1/01. Applicant shall comply with DPW's

recommendation/condition in their letter dated 10/1/01.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Prevention Guide No.46

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? <u>Located approximately 600 feet from the 14 Freeway</u>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? <u>Surrounded by vacant land</u>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>Parking lot having 25 spaces requires NPDES compliance</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>Parking lot having 25 spaces requires NPDES compliance</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 (DPW)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Applicant shall comply with NPDES requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and

the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
				<i>Proposed Northside connector trail</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

Color of buildings shall be subdued to blend in with the surroundings

CONCLUSION

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? <i>Access may be inadequate.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)
MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Page 45 of 57

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Caltrans has no objection to the project in their letter dated 4/30/01. DPW concluded that project will not have

significant impacts in their letters dated 5/29/01 and 7/30/01.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

Private septic system

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES – 3. Education

N/A

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Fire Mitigation Fee

Applicant shall comply with all conditions and recommendations of the County's Sheriff Department in their

Letter dated 4/25/01..

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐

Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
-
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
-
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
-
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
-
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?
-

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- ☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

- ☐ Potentially significant significant/No impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? <i>Auto fluids used for maintenance</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

Applicant shall comply with all ordinances, codes, and regulations with respect to hazardous materials

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
				<i>Zone change required</i>
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

Zone Change/Conditional Use Permit Case No. 00-119-(5)

☐ Potentially significant
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than